

REMARKSClaim Changes

Claim 1 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 3; claim 3 is canceled.

Claims 14 – 15 have been newly added. Support for the new claims can be found at least on page 8, para [0020] and page 13, para [0031] of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claims 4 – 6 have been amended to clarify and simplify the language.

Claim 7 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 9; claim 9 is canceled.

Claim 8 is amended to correct a typographical error.

Claims 16 – 17 have been newly added. Support for the new claims can be found at least on page 8, para [0020] and page 13, para [0031] of the specification as filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

Claims 10 – 12 have been amended to clarify and simplify the language.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of claims 3 – 6, 9 -12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out the omitted steps. The Office Action rejected claims 3 – 6 and 9 – 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant submits that claims 15 and 17 have been newly added to mention

the steps which were omitted and accounted to a gap between steps. Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

The Office Action rejected claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant submits that claims 4 and 10 as amended overcome this rejection. Accordingly, the rejection is believed to be moot. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims

In response to the objection to claims 3 – 6 and 8 - 12 for informalities, Applicant has spelled the abbreviations in independent claims 1 and 7, as amended.

In response to the objection to claims 8 for informalities, Applicant has reworded “device” to “document” for clarity as requested.

Rejection of claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by US 2004/0158619 (Pedersen et al)

Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention. Applicant therefore respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1 – 3, 7 – 9, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Pedersen as herein amended.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the present application and the cited art and has amended independent claims 1 and 7 to clarify the claimed invention. In particular, independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended to recite “the device management characteristic includes at least one of a uniform source identifier (URI) parameter, an operational (OP) parameter, and a DATA parameter.”

Applicant respectfully submits that Pedersen does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in independent claims 1 and 7. Specifically, independent claim 1 and 7 recite “the device management characteristic includes at least one of a uniform source identifier (URI) parameter, an operational (OP) parameter, and a DATA parameter”, which is not anticipated either expressly or inherently, in Pederson.

Pederson is directed to a method of processing a received provisioning document. Pederson’s provisioning document comprises a first parameter and a second parameter. Pederson’s Abstract. According to Pederson’s FIG. 2 and description of FIG. 2 on page 2 and page 3, if the received provisioning document is a BOOTSRAP, then an address of the physical WAP proxy entity is obtained and the database is queried using the address (TX_ADDR). According to Pederson’s FIG. 3 and description of FIG. 3 on page 3, after receiving the provisioning document, it is determined whether the BOOTSTRAP NAME has a value or not. The NAME value is stored if its there, otherwise it is checked that whether the BOOTSTRAP PROURL has a value or not. Again, the PROURL value is stored if its there, otherwise PXLOGICAL NAME is stored. According to Pederson’s FIG. 4 and description on page 4, after receiving the provisioning document resource type and operative parameters are identified and then the identified operative parameters are stored. Therefore, Pederson does not disclose “the device management characteristic includes at least one of a uniform source identifier (URI) parameter, an operational (OP) parameter, and a DATA parameter”, as required by independent claim 1 and 7.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Pedersen does not anticipate, either expressly or inherently, each and every element as set forth in new dependent claims 14 and 16. Dependent claim 14 and 16 require the further limitation of “the OP parameter includes at least an ADD value, a REPLACE value, a DELETE, and an EXECUTE.” In contrast, Pedersen on page 4, para [0112], refers the operative parameters to include the value of URI parameter and the value of NAME parameter, along with AAUTHNAME and AAUTHSECRET, if present. Applicant’s claims 14 and 16 requires the operative parameters to be at least an ADD value, a REPLACE value, a DELETE, and an

EXECUTE. Therefore, the Pedersen does not disclose “the OP parameter includes at least an ADD value, a REPLACE value, a DELETE, and an EXECUTE.”

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Pedersen does not disclose the claimed limitations of independent claims 1 and 7, and new dependent claims 14 and 16. Applicant therefore submits that claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by Pedersen and therefore the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 USC 102(a), (e) should be withdrawn. Applicant requests that claims 1 and 7 may now be passed to allowance.

Dependent claims 2, 8, and 13 depend from, and include all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 7. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of dependent claims 2, 8, and 13 and requests the withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions, comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept.
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048
Customer Number: 20280

By: HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 02/18/2008
Hisashi D. Watanabe Date
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 37,465
Tel. No. (847) 523-2322
Fax No. (847) 523-2350
Email: docketing.libertyville@motorola.com